



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,342	04/01/2004	Ayad Abdul-Ahad	073259-0105	8570

22428 7590 09/05/2007
FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP
SUITE 500
3000 K STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

SEHARASEYON, JEGATHEESAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1647

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/05/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/815,342	Applicant(s) ABDUL-AHAD ET AL.	
	Examiner Jegatheesan Seharaseyon, Ph.D	Art Unit 1647	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 17-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 17-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to Applicant's amendments and remarks filed on 6/04/2007. Applicant has cancelled claims 1-16. Claims 17-37 have been newly added. Therefore, claims 17-37 are examined.

2. It is noted that Applicant has amended the specification to capitalize trademarks.

3. Any objection or rejection of record, which is not expressly repeated in this action, has been overcome by Applicant's response and withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103(maintained)

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4a. The rejection of claims 17-37 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gottesman (abstract published 3/2003, Reference 8 in PTO1449 of 7/06/2005) as evidenced by Giovannoni (2002) in view of Shirley et al. (6, 887, 462) is maintained for

Art Unit: 1647

reasons set forth in the Office Action dated 3/2/2007 (pages 12-14). This rejection was previously applied to claims 1-16.

Applicant is arguing that the dosage taught by these references falls outside the scope of the claimed invention. Specifically, Applicant asserts that Shirley does not disclose a method of treating a patient for multiple sclerosis comprising administering a pharmaceutical composition comprising a dosage greater than either 500µg up to about 1000µg, or greater than 500µg to about 625µg, of a IFN-β mutein with a deletion or substitution of Cys17 with a neutral amino acid. Applicant further asserts that Shirley merely discloses IFN-β compositions without human serum albumin. Thus, Applicant claims that the combination of the references does not arrive at the claimed invention, and therefore cannot render the claimed invention obvious. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive.

With reference to Applicant's argument that the dosage taught by these references falls outside the scope of the claimed invention, MPEP 2144.05 [R-5] states that generally, differences in concentration or temperature will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration or temperature is critical. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955) (Claimed process which was performed at a temperature between 40°C and 80°C and an acid concentration between 25% and 70% was held to be prima facie obvious over a reference process which differed from the claims only in

Art Unit: 1647

that the reference process was performed at a temperature of 100°C and an acid concentration of 10%.); see also Peterson, 315 F.3d at 1330, 65 USPQ2d at 1382 ("The normal desire of scientists or artisans to improve upon what is already generally known provides the motivation to determine where in a disclosed set of percentage ranges is the optimum combination of percentages."). Therefore, optimization of the dosage is considered obvious over prior art. Applicant is also arguing that Shirley does not disclose a method of treating a patient for multiple sclerosis comprising administering a pharmaceutical composition comprising a dosage greater than either 500µg up to about 1000µg, or greater than 500µg to about 625µg, of a IFN-β mutein with a deletion or substitution of Cys17 with a neutral amino acid. The reference was added to teach IFN-β composition without human serum albumin. It is noted that, it is not necessary that the claimed invention be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references to justify combining their teachings; rather the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 288 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). Thus, the claimed invention would have been *prima facie* obvious as a whole at the time it was made, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary. Therefore, the instant invention is obvious over Gottesman (abstract published 3/2003, Reference 8 in PTO1449 of 7/06/2005) as evidenced by Giovannoni (2002) in view of Shirley et al. (6, 887, 462).

Conclusion

5. No claims are allowable.

6.THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jegatheesan Seharaseyon, Ph.D whose telephone number is 571-272-0892. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Manjunath N. Rao, Ph. D can be reached on 571-272-0939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 1647

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JS

Art Unit 1647

September 3rd, 2007

**CHRISTINE J. SAUD
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Christine J. Saud